

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/611,344	06/30/2003	William W. Macy JR.	42P15762	3746	
8791 7590 12/19/2006 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN				INER	
12400 WILSH	IRE BOULEVARD		GEIB, BENJAMIN P		
SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		·	2181		
	•				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/19/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/611,344		MACY ET AL.	•
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin P. Geib	2181	

	Benjamin P. Geib	2181				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 November 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		12C/-) and the annuari	In extension foo			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u> 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since			
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	I within the time period set forth in 3	37 CFR 41.37(a).				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		duaina ar aimplifiúna	the innues for			
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li></ul>	tter form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	iected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		,				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			` *			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a			ent canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).						
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		ill be entered and an	explanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1,4,7-14,17-26,29,30,34-36,39-48,52 a	and 53 as indicated in Final Office A	<u>Action</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			_			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered be <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	(/	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
2.   Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).   FRHZ FLEMING     3.   Other:     SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER     SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER						
•	SUPERV	ISORY PATENT LAND	00			
·	TEUR	12/5/19	206			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to the Applicant's argument that the least significant bit of the operation field (i.e. the flush to zero bit) of Rice is not the claimed flush to zero bit, the Examiner notes that the Applicant appears to be reading the claim too narrowly. The current claim language does not exclude the flush to zero bit from operating in conjunction with other bits to perform the desired operation of flushing to zero. The least significant bit of the operation field of Rice must be set as indicated in Table 1 in order to perform the operation of flushing to zero. Therefore, the least significant bit of the operation field of Rice does have a special purpose, albiet in conjunction with other bits. If the Applicant intends for the claimed first portion to consist of a single bit that performs the desired operation alone (i.e. not in conjunction with other bits), then the claims should be amended to indicate such functionality.

The Examiner has reviewed Applicant's argument regarding design choice and has not found the material relied upon by the Applicant at the cited paragraph. Therefore, Applicant's argument is not found persuasive..